REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10 and 18 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 16 and 18-25 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 9-10, 16, 18 and 21-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,144 (Dunn et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,528,680 (Karpicke). Claims 2-5, 11-13 and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. in view of Karpicke and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,692,033 (Farris).

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview held on June 15, 2006. At the interview, agreement was reached that Karpicke does not disclose or suggest comparing an area code of the calling party number with an area code of the termination subscriber, where the comparing occurs before any area codes are stored.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 16, 18 and 21-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. in view of Karpicke. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of Dunn et al. in Applicant's previously filed response and reassert all arguments submitted in that response. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

13

Karpicke discloses a caller-ID telephone station having a caller-ID based directory of telephone numbers that automatically adapts its directory to compensate for a change to the area code for which the telephone station is located. The caller-ID telephone station stores the area code for all incoming caller-ID telephone numbers along with each telephone number received. The telephone station also stores its home area code. The home area code is input by a user during an initialization step when the telephone station is first installed, moved to a different area code or the stations locale is changed to a different area code. In response to a request from the user for dialing a telephone number entered into the directory, the telephone station compares the stored area code received as part of the caller-ID telephone number with the stored home area code and determines from this comparison whether to include or omit the received area code as part of the dialed telephone number.

Regarding claims 1, 10 and 18, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, comparing an area code of the calling party number with an area code of the termination subscriber, or storing a calling party number of a origination subscriber if the termination subscriber has registered for the calling party number call back service, where the storing the calling party comprises storing the calling party number exclusive of the area code if the two area codes are identical to each other, and storing both the

14

area code and the corresponding calling party number if the two area codes are different from each other.

The Examiner admits that Dunn et al, does not disclose or suggest where the storing the calling party comprises storing the calling party number exclusive of the area code if the two area codes are identical to each other, and storing both the area code and the corresponding calling party number if the two area codes are different from each other, but asserts that Karpicke discloses these limitations in the abstract and col. 4, line 51 through col. 5, line 17. However, these portions merely disclose that in Karpicke a complete name and the received caller-ID telephone number including the area code is stored into memory, as well as the area code and number of the user as the user moves. Further, as noted previously, the home area code of the user is compared with the stored area code and number as part of the caller-ID telephone number to determine whether to include or omit the received area code as part of the dialed number. The Examiner appears to have misunderstood the Karpicke reference. This reference teaches away from the limitations in the claims of the present application. In Karpicke, the area code of both the user and the caller (i.e., from the caller-ID telephone number) are always stored. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to comparing an area code of the calling party with an area code of the termination subscriber and storing the calling party number exclusive of the area code if the two area codes are identical to each other, and storing both the area code and the corresponding calling party number only if the two area

codes are different from each other. Karpicke does not disclose or suggest these limitations in

the claims of the present application since Karpicke clearly discloses that the area codes of the

calling party <u>are always stored</u>.

Moreover, Karpicke discloses storing all area codes, then <u>comparing the stored area</u>

<u>codes</u>. In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present invention recite comparing an

area code of the calling party number with an area code of the termination subscriber, where <u>the</u>

<u>comparing occurs before any area codes are stored</u>.

Regarding claims 7, 9, 16 and 21-25, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent

on one of independent claims 1, 10 and 18 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same

reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any

proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of

each of claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 16, 18 and 21-25 of the present application. Applicant respectfully

requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 2-5, 11-13, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dunn et al. in view of Karpicke and further in view of Farris. Applicant

respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that these claims are dependent on one of

independent claims 1, 10 and 18 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons

16

noted previously regarding these independent claims. Applicant submits that Farris does not overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Dunn et al. and Karpicke.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 2-5, 11-13, 19 and 20 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 16 and 18-25 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

John C. Eisenhart
Registration No. 38,128
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 JCE/FDB:tlg
Date: June 16, 2006
\\Fk4\Documents\2000\2000-085\90518.doc
Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

18